

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 1 has been amended. Claims 10-12 and 14-16 stand in condition for allowance, claims 2, 5, 8, and 9 stand objected, and claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-7 stand rejected.

Claims 1-12 and 14-16 are pending and under consideration.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102:

In the Advisory Action, at page 2, claims 1, 4, 6, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6, 226,756 to Mueller ("Mueller"). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action refers to FIG. 1 and FIG. 3 as teaching "a central processing section, which is formed on a chip, and a peripheral control section which is formed on another chip," as recited in independent claim 1. FIG. 1 illustrates computer system 100 including a computer subsystem 102, an interface 104, and configuration inputs 106. See FIG. 1 and column 2, lines 61-67. FIG. 3 illustrates a processor 310, but neither the figure nor the corresponding description of FIG. 3 teaches or suggests that the processor 310 is formed on one chip where the computer subsystem 102 is formed on another chip.

In addition, Mueller fails to teach or suggest "wherein said system reset output section supplies said system reset signal **to both chips** of said central processing section and said peripheral control section," emphasis added, as recited in independent claim 1. Rather, the hard reset is supplied to the processor in the interface 104. The interface 104 then provides the system logic 108 with a uniform hard reset signal at least a predetermined number of clock cycles before the processor included in the interface 104 becomes stable and ready to execute instructions, thereby allowing the system logic 108 sufficient time to complete sufficient initialization required for the hard reset. See column 7, lines 53-62 of Mueller.

In addition, in Mueller, the reset signal is generated when the emulator 305 receives an external reset signal. However, rather than teaching or suggesting, "system reset output section supplies said system reset signal **to both chips** of said central processing section and said peripheral control section," emphasis added, as recited in independent claim 1, Mueller provides the reset signal from the emulator 305 for the processor 310 and the system logic 108, which is coupled to and may reference and/or modify data in memory 110. See FIG. 3 and column 3,

lines 1-3 of Mueller.

Further, assuming, *arguendo*, that the push-button result is interpreted as the external reset signal, there is nothing in Mueller that teaches or suggests that based on the push-button reset **and** an emulator reset signal, the system reset output section supplies said system reset signal “to both chips of said central processing section and said peripheral control section,” as recited in independent claim 1. Instead, the reset signal from the emulator 305 is supplied first to the processor 310 **and then**, the processor 310 supplies the signal to the system logic 108. See column 7, lines 53-62 of Mueller.

Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that Mueller fails to teach or suggest all the claimed features of independent claim 1. It is respectfully requested that independent claim 1 and related dependent claims be allowed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:

In the Office Action, at page 3, claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Mueller. The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The arguments presented above are incorporated herein to support the patentability of claim 3/1 over Mueller.

According to the Office Action, without providing any basis from a reference, it is conclusively asserted that “it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to put the system reset output section in the chip of the peripheral control section. It would have been obvious because Mueller discloses that his invention is intended to cover various equivalent arrangements within the scope.” In addition, the Office Action recites case law asserting that “rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art.” However, that assertion is proper so long as the properties and operating characteristics are the same between the cited reference and the presently claimed invention. Applicants respectfully assert that the benefits and properties of the presently claimed invention are not provided in Mueller.

Specifically, one of the many advantages of the system reset output section of the present invention is that the system reset signal may be distributed and supplied to separate chips (e.g., a processor and a companion chip) on a basis of the emulator reset signal and the

external reset signal. However, the cited reference provides no such advantage. Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that Mueller fails to teach or suggest all the claimed features of independent claim 1. It is respectfully requested that independent claim 1 and related dependent claims be allowed.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited. At a minimum, this Amendment should be entered at least for purposes of Appeal as it either clarifies and/or narrows the issues for consideration by the Board.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited and possibly concluded by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss any such remaining issues.


If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _____ September 13, 2004 _____

By: _____


Alicia M. Choi
Registration No. 46,621

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501